

a different way, in that kind of a meat-ax approach, to use those words, is not a good thing to do. It is not an appropriate budgeting thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to commend my friend, not only for his athletic ability and his talents on the basketball court, but also for his focus and discipline in regards to this issue.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, I have three amendments that have not been voted on yet, so I invite the gentleman to support them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in the city of Akron, which I represent a part of, their obligation for the EPA is \$400 million in the city of Akron. Our friends on the other side are saying that there is no role for the Federal Government to play.

You have communities like Akron, you have communities like Youngstown that have lost significant industry over the past 20 or 30 years; and if we want to bring industry back, if we want to grow industry, we can't have brownfields all over our cities.

This is an investment. This is going to clean the site up. This is an opportunity for us to redevelop sites in our communities.

Now, 30 years ago when the steel mills were pumping, when the rubber industry was pumping, a lot of our tax dollars were going to many of your communities to help lay down roads, build the interstate, rail lines, water infrastructure, all of these things. What this bill does is it tries to reinvest back into some of these communities. We want to be self-sufficient, but we don't have the local tax base. There is a role here for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends, why would you want to prevent us from cleaning up brownfield sites in the old industrial areas? We don't need it forever. We just need to clean them up, and then we will have a tax base there and have more taxpayers to pay taxes and keep the tax rates low for everybody, because we will have more. But if we can't develop these sites, it becomes very, very difficult for us to grow our local economy.

We need the Federal Government to make these investments, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side, if I may?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

I just would point out to my good friend from Ohio that no specific pro-

grams are identified in this decrease in the increase. So to identify specific programs is a spurious argument, truly.

I would also say that this points out fundamentally the difference between the two parties. We believe fundamentally that individuals spend their money more wisely than the government. It is clear that the majority party does not believe that. They believe that they spend the taxpayer money much more wisely. We just think that is a fundamental difference.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), on this appropriate amendment of fiscal responsibility.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I just walked in a moment ago. I was on the streets of Washington, D.C. where the heat is truly on this Nation's Capital in the high nineties and the humidity is also in the high nineties, and here we come to the inside of Chambers, where the heat is being put on, on the American taxpayer and the American family; but this time it is being placed on them by the Democrats and majority party.

Six months into control by the Democrats, and what have they wrought for this Nation? The largest tax increase in U.S. history; an attempt to change the rules on the American public going back to 1820; and last week, of course, we saw as well the idea by the Democrats that they should have some sort of slush fund where your tax dollars go unequated for.

When you look at the basic math I was trying to do here, look at the equation, what they give us is this: a tax increase plus a spending increase leads to an answer of an increased burden on the American taxpayer.

I have had the opportunity now to serve on the Budget Committee for 4 years; and during that time the Democrats, when they were in the minority, railed against us time after time saying we were spending too much. I thought that railing would stop once they were in the majority and they had the opportunity to go in the other direction. But as we have seen here, the railing has not stopped. They continue to point to the past about increased spending, but they then at the same token, out of their same mouths, what do they do? They increase spending on the American public again.

If the problem in the past was that the U.S. Government was spending too much, you would think that the simple solution to that, the simple answer to that math equation, would be spend less. But this budget does not do that. This spending bill does not do that. That is why I support the gentleman from Georgia's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington resumes control of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the gentleman from Georgia who said the individual taxpayers can spend their money better than government. The taxpayers in my district can't clean a brownfield, go out with 50 bucks and clean a brownfield. This is something we need to do collectively as a community and as a country, to clean that up. Individuals can't do that.

Individuals couldn't build the interstate highways and the railroads and the Panama Canal and all the great infrastructure projects that we have had. We need help to do this in some communities so we can be self-sufficient, and individuals can't do that.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to say to my colleagues, the reason we have to make this increase in the Interior appropriations budget is because over the last 6 or 7 years the budgets for these agencies have been reduced dramatically. The Interior Department has been cut by 16 percent. We have lost rangers at every national park in the Nation. The summer workers have been cut back. The services there are not as good as they used to be.

This was a crisis. The National Parks Conservation Association had a pamphlet, "The Endangered Ranger." Here it was, our national parks, our national treasure, in decline.

I am not an extremist. I am a moderate in this House, and I always have been. But this was a true crisis. And what we had to do was stop this decline, this downward trend of our national wildlife refuges, our national parks, and we put a little extra money in to get it turned up, so we could hire a few more people, so we could cover the fixed costs of the rangers and the people running these wildlife refuges.

That is why we had to do this. It was a crisis. And it is going to take us a number of years to get back. We only increased this budget by 4.3 percent. With a 16-percent cut, it would take 4 years to get back to where we were in 2001. With EPA, it would take about 7 years to get back to where we were. And with a 35-percent cut in the Forest Service, it would take about 8 years to get back. So we have a long ways to go, and I don't want to have any downward direction here.

I do say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is right, the 1 percent could be taken anywhere, and that might mean that all of the projects of interest to the Members would be eliminated by the administration. Now, I hope they wouldn't do that. I hope they wouldn't fall into that trap. But that is one possibility.

So, again, I resent the gentleman from Georgia even suggesting that we aren't over here fighting against your amendments. We just looked at the